

---

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 are pending, with claims 1 and 13 being independent.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 13 following the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences Decision mailed on August 12, 2006. Support for the amendment may be found at least, for example, as illustrated in Fig. 4 and described in the specification at p. 8, lines 10-30.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection**

Claims 1-5, 11-17, 23 and 24 stand rejected as being anticipated by Bar-Niv (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,142). Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 13 to obviate the rejection. As amended, both claims 1 and 13 recite that the wake-up control and the power down control are separate elements.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Bar-Niv does not describe, suggest or render obvious a transceiver state machine that includes a wake-up control and a power down control, where the wake-up control and the power down control are separate elements. Instead, as found in the Board Decision mailed August 12, 2009, the Board agreed with the Examiner's finding that Bar-Niv discloses an energy-on state machine and power module which together act as both a wake-up control and a power down control for the transceiver. Applicants have amended the claims to recite that the wake-up control and the power down control are separate elements. Nowhere does Bar-Niv disclose a control which sends power control signals to a transmitter and a separate control which sends power control signals to all components of the transceiver.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of independent claims 1 and 13 and their respective dependent claims 2-5, 11, 12, 14-17, 23 and 24.

---

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection**

Dependent claims 6-10, which depend from amended independent claim 1, and 18-22, which depend from amended independent claim 13, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bar-Niv in view of Uppunda (U.S. Patent No. 6,678,728). Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 13 to obviate the rejection. Uppunda does not remedy the shortcomings of Bar-Niv to describe that the wake-up control and the power down control are separate elements. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 6-10 and 18-22 based on their dependencies from amended independent claims 1 and 13 and for at least the reasons discussed above.

**Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney (202-470-6457) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as intended to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Enclosed are the fees for a Request for Continued Examination. If necessary, please charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3521, referencing Attorney Docket No. 0063-026001/BU1483.

Respectfully submitted,  
Brake Hughes Bellermann LLP  
Customer Number 57246  
202-470-6457

BY: /Joseph F. Key, Reg. No. 44827/

Date October 12, 2009

Joseph F. Key  
Reg. No. 44,827